

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application, claims 1 and 4-5 having been withdrawn as being directed to non-elected subject matter. By this Amendment, claim 2 is amended and new claim 6 is added. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,650) [102(e)] or over Maeda et al. (EP 927,778) [102(a)]. These rejections are traversed as they may apply to the amended claims.

In particular, in order to make even more clear the distinctive aspect of the present invention over the cited prior art, Applicants have amended claim 2. Thus, it is specified that a higher concentration of the conductive material in a surface portion of the electrode is obtained by subjecting the conductive material to two or more runs of a rolling treatment. This additional feature is clearly disclosed in the filed text at page 18, lines 1-4; and at page 19, line 8 to page 21, lines 13 referring to [Example I].

As found in the description of [Example I] and as can be seen from Table 2, if the number of runs of the rolling treatment is increased, the resistance of contact between the collectors 26, 29 and the polarizing electrode e is correspondingly decreased and hence, the internal resistance of the electric double-layer capacitor 17 is decreased advantageously. This leads to an enhancement in electrostatic capacity.

The present specification further describes in connection with [Example I] that if the practicality and productivity of the electric double-layer capacitor 17 are taken into consideration, the internal resistance of the electric double-layer capacitor 17 becomes suitably equal to or lower than 2.7 mΩ and hence, the number of runs of the rolling

treatment is preferably seven or more (see page 21, the middle paragraph). In view of this, Applicants have added new claim 6.

In the case of the cited two Maeda et al. references relied upon in the Office Action, both of these references appear to fail to teach or suggest the idea of intentionally raising the concentration of a conductive material at a surface portion of an electrode nor the advantages provided thereby. Since any additional reference has not been cited regarding this feature, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention defined in amended claim 2 is patentable.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to Attorney Docket No. 107348-00032.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert K. Carpenter", written over a horizontal line.

Robert K. Carpenter
Registration No. 34,794

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RKC/tdd